

### **REMARKS**

The Office Action dated March 14, 2006 has been received and carefully noted. The above amendments to the abstract and claims, and the following remarks, are submitted as a full and complete response thereto.

The abstract is amended. Claims 8-16 are amended to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112 and 35 U.S.C. 101. No new matter is added. Applicants gratefully acknowledge the indication that claims 1-7 and 17-25 are allowable. Claims 8-16 are respectfully submitted for consideration.

The Office Action stated that the listing of references in the specification is not a proper Information Disclosure Statement, and any such references were not considered by the Examiner. Applicants respectfully submit that any references in the specification were formally submitted in Information Disclosure Statements filed on May 6, 2005 and November 14, 2005. Accordingly, it is respectfully asserted that the information provided and described in the specification is complete.

The Office Action objected to the specification because the abstract is not in proper format. Specifically, the Office Action asserted that the abstract contains legal phraseology and phrases that can be implied. Applicants respectfully submit that abstract as amended does not contain legal phraseology and phrases that can be implied. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection to the specification is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejected claims 8-16 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention.

Specifically, the Office Action asserted that claims 8-16 are directed to an apparatus and contain method steps, and are therefore indefinite.

Applicants respectfully submit that in light of the above-mentioned amendments, claims 8-16 particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejected claims 8-16 under 35 U.S.C. 101 for being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Specifically, the Office Action asserted that these claims are directed to neither a “process” nor a “machine” but rather embraces or overlaps two different statutory classes of invention set forth in 35 U.S.C. 101.

Applicants respectfully submit that in light of the above-mentioned amendments, claims 8-16 are directed to an apparatus, which is statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. 101. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 101 is respectfully requested.

Applicants respectfully submit that in light of the above amendments and remarks, each of claims 1-25 is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that each of claims 1-25 be allowed and this application passed to issue.

If for any reason the Examiner determines that the application is not now in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact, by telephone, the applicant’s undersigned attorney at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this application.

In the event this paper is not being timely filed, the applicant respectfully petitions for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension together with any additional fees may be charged to Counsel's Deposit Account 50-2222.

Respectfully submitted,



David E. Brown

Registration No. 51,091

**Customer No. 32294**

SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY LLP

14<sup>TH</sup> Floor

8000 Towers Crescent Drive

Tysons Corner, Virginia 22182-2700

Telephone: 703-720-7800

Fax: 703-720-7802

DEB:jf:jkm